



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,731	05/31/2002	Jurg Faas	OBJ-2775	5067

7590 10/28/2004

Stephen E Bondura
Dority & Manning
Post Office Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449

EXAMINER

ROSE, ROBERT A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/786,731

Applicant(s)

FAAS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Rose

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-50 and 61-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 41-42, 50, 61-74 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39,40 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 61-74 have been added.
2. Claims 1-38, and 51-60 have been canceled.
3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 39-40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sykes. Sykes discloses a grinding apparatus for grinding individual clothing elements of a carding machine comprising substantially all of the subject matter set forth in applicant's claims above. The grinding apparatus comprises abrasive ridges separated by radially inwardly disposed abrasive valleys to work the lateral sides and ends of the carding teeth. To make the abrasive ridges and valleys as separate elements in the device of Sykes in order to allow the elements to be individually replaced when worn or damaged would have been an obvious matter of design choice to those of ordinary skill in the art.
6. Claims 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sykes in view of Demuth et al. Demuth et al disclose a grinding device for a carding machine comprising a grinding element surrounded by a suction housing to prevent

Art Unit: 3723

debris from entering the carding machine, and a means for periodically controlling the application of the grinding device to the carding elements(column 10, lines 50-54). To provide a suction housing for the grinding device in Sykes, spanning the width of the carding machine elements, to remove debris resulting from the grinding operation and prevent contamination of the carding machine components, would have been obvious in view of Demuth et al. To further provide a control system in Sykes for applying the grinding device at predetermined intervals and for specific time periods of operation of the carding machine, would have been obvious in view of Demuth et al.

7. Claims 41-42, 50, and 61-74 are allowed.

8. Claim 44 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Applicant's arguments filed July 14, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Sykes clearly shows in figure 1 a grinding apparatus with abrasive elements capable of penetrating between individual clothing elements to grind the side surfaces thereof, and recessed abrasive regions which are capable of grinding front face sides of the clothing elements.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3723

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (703) 308-1360.

Rr

October 26, 2004.

Robert Rose
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3723

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert Rose', is written over the printed name and title.